

TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT - ANNUAL PI EVALUATION

The Community Relations Plan of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requires an annual survey to determine the effectiveness of public involvement activities. This evaluation covers a reporting period from January 2001 through January 2002.

The Tri-Party Agencies mailed a survey to the membership of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) and announced it in the Hanford Happenings publication. The survey was also made available online at the Ecology Website. Thirty-one individuals completed the survey. Twenty-one were submitted on paper, 10 were submitted via the Internet. The results are printed below.

Comments were taken directly as contributed. Words underlined or capitalized by participants were *italicized* in this report for emphasis. [Square bracketed items are spelled out acronyms, for ease of understanding.] [[double brackets indicate places where the language was modified.]]

Average scores are the average of all responses, i.e., if no rank was given, it was not counted in the total.
Mode is the answer given most frequently.

1 -Written materials from the Tri-Party Agencies were mailed to you with enough time to review them and respond.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)	1	2	3	4	5
Average = 3.9					
Mode=4 (1 gave no rank)					
<i>Thirteen participants gave additional input, as follows:</i>					

- ◆ DOE/RL 95-73 Draft for external review; I had to ask for a copy, technical reports seem to arrive hit or miss.
- ◆ Notices mailed with enough lead time, but additional materials typically not available in timely manner. Notices often lack key information on *how proposed decision affects public's values*. Community Relations Plan acknowledges that this is the standard.
- ◆ Documents usually appeared in my mailbox in time to react.
- ◆ Almost all provided 30 days, but seems like a couple of fact sheets were late. Still, 20-30 days should be sufficient.
- ◆ More than a few times items were postmarked after the start of a public comment. Comment periods should not begin until after materials have reached potential reviewers.
- ◆ Somehow I was left off **Hanford Happenings** mailing list. All other mailings timely.
- ◆ Notice on State of the Site meetings was short.
- ◆ Usually they come after public comment begins.
- ◆ I have several times gotten responses to meetings months after the meetings, and details of the meetings had become fuzzy in my mind by then—it would have been more helpful to have gotten them sooner.
- ◆ I think materials are showing significant improvement - it is important to use plain language, and incorporate well marked maps to get ideas across to the public. The "We Can Do It" flyer was especially good.
- ◆ Sometimes the Tri-Party Agencies send material on time, sometimes not. The notice on events like State of the Site was definitely good, but there was nothing there one could respond to without attending a meeting.
- ◆ Generally, the **Hanford Happenings** arrives if not on the day that a comment period starts or meeting occurs, several days later. Because I have contacts and am able to attend Tri-Party Agency Quarterly Meetings, I usually know that something is going on, but I don't believe the public is receiving adequate notice. If a date is TBA [to be announced], then say it is TBA, but don't wait to send the mailing out for one missing date. I understand that government mail rooms are slow, but take this into consideration in the publication process.
- ◆ The schedule for **Hanford Update** and **Hanford Happenings** are not "firm" enough yet.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 26 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.7**

2 -Written materials were visually interesting and easy to understand.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)

1 2 3 4 5

Average = 3.5

Mode=4 (3 gave no rank)

3 9 14 2

Fourteen participants gave additional input, as follows:

- ◆ They are getting better - I think we need to upgrade to color materials and continue to pressure writers to be clear, using simple terms and no acronyms.
- ◆ 100/300 Area TPA Changes failed to meet MTCA requirements of identifying land area and resources that *are* or *will be* restricted. Advice on how to incorporate this easily, via a map, was ignored.
- ◆ Obviously it's difficult to capture everything in a one-page fact flyer. But the lack of maps is a big issue for me. I believe that people find it easier to understand when there are good visuals to stimulate a response.
- ◆ Latest fact sheet on 100 & 300 Areas very good.
- ◆ There is a wide range of materials. Some are very easy to read and very eye-catching. Some are still much too technical and full of jargon. The State of the Site flyer was very eye-catching.
- ◆ Getting better- 100/300 Area had HAB input, State of the Site info was outside normal agency "box."
- ◆ The piece on the 100/300 Area was an improvement, keep it up. The colored flyer was great.
- ◆ Information on change packages that I was working on were kept up-to-date and were easily understood.
- ◆ Use of color for State of the Site meetings was very good addition.
- ◆ Not all materials are interesting to me.
- ◆ Sometimes fact sheets are clear about process but so abbreviated that the substantive issues are not clear.
- ◆ They were visually interesting, all right. Sometimes 'arresting' might have been a better word. But I picked up five handouts at one meeting, and all of them had virtually the same text. Sometimes whole paragraphs appeared to have been simply pasted from one handout to the other, and the information I was looking for was not included. In more bulky documents I sometimes found partial answers, but only by reading straight through—indexing was spotty at best. Also, though one document contained an acronym list and glossary (useful in any document of more than five pages), I concluded that some of the acronyms were undesirable, in that the terms so foreshortened should always be spelled out (for example, 'low level') and that the glossary entries were sometimes obscure and unclear. In some cases a diagram would have helped (for example, a diagram of the geology of the Hanford Site), in others rewording is definitely necessary—where definitions are taken from other sources (e.g., RCRA definitions,) advice on how to access those definitions is necessary; some definitions were circular, others used words like 'appropriate' and 'threshold' with no further definitions (who decides what's 'appropriate', what is the 'threshold'?). One glaring example: 'radionuclide' is defined in a way that, but for the last phrase ('that happens to emit radiation') is a definition of all atoms. There is wide room for improvement here.
- ◆ The State of the Site flyers were visually interesting, but they were basically a promotional piece with little information. Most of the Request for Comment fact sheets are dull and "institutional" looking. There is a lot of text, little graphics, and no titles that make me care about the content.
- ◆ The agencies have done a good job getting materials posted to the Web sites, especially the Ecology Web.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 26 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.5**

3 - Materials were available and easily accessible over the Internet.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)

1 2 3 4 5

Average = 3.2

Mode = 5

2 2 5 6 7

Thirteen participants gave additional input as follows:

- ◆ The agencies have done an excellent job getting materials posted to the Web sites - especially the Ecology's!
- ◆ 1. EPA Administrative record is worthless for access. Technology effectively precludes public use.
- 2. CERCLA/RCRA documents have been improperly removed – preventing public comment-- e.g., on 100/300 TPA change documents like 300 FFC characterization work plans, etc., are no longer on Web. Historical documentation on releases also removed.
- ◆ Were - I am concerned about this important part of transparency in site decision-making process being curtailed due to potential national security impacts.
- ◆ HAB homepage not always current – e.g. meeting schedules, etc.
- ◆ A day or two lag usually.
- ◆ No problem with the Website.
- ◆ HAB and ORP Websites are quite useful.
- ◆ Available, yes, but not always easy to locate.
- ◆ Generally much improved. ECY site very good. It's sometimes hard to find current materials relating to public comment periods on the Hanford Web site—takes considerable “fishing”. I haven't tried EPA site(s.)
- ◆ Ecology's Web site is very well organized. DOE also has had lots of information on the Web. The recent removal of many sites for security needs to be reviewed. EPA does not provide information electronically.
- ◆ I believe the notices of comment periods and meetings are available on the Web, but it is often hard to access every thing in one place. I often have to search around the Hanford DOE Website for announcements. The Ecology site is much better about putting PI stuff up front. I am disturbed that much information regarding everything from cleanup budgets to basic information on clean-up and health and safety have been removed from the DOE Website and Hanford contractor Websites. Some of this info is needed for one to make informed comments and to get involved in the public process. It is not necessary to remove all of these documents for security purposes — this negates citizen participation and trust.
- ◆ I wasn't even able to access this survey as cited.
- ◆ I often use the Ecology Website to learn about Hanford activities and public involvement opportunities.

There were no questions about the Internet in the 2000 PI Survey with which to compare.

Please Note - Questions 4 & 5 were flip-flopped in the online survey.
The question online that had a write-in option is listed as question four here.

4 - Did the written materials you received motivate you to attend a meeting or to contact the Tri-Parties about an issue?

Yes- 14

No-5

Don't know- 2

No response- 10

- ◆ I usually attend anyway, not just because of Agency materials.
- ◆ I go to everything that I can!
- ◆ Again, the State of the Site visuals were good — other publications have not stirred me.
- ◆ Yes- especially State of Site meetings. Also fact sheets on change packages were good.

For the 2000 PI Survey, the answers from 25 responses were:

Yes-8

No-16

Don't Know- 1

5 - Did you hear about TPA meetings through notices in the newspaper, on the radio, or where?

Yes- 13

No- 6

Don't know- 2

No response- 10

6 listed newspaper 1 listed all forms of media, and eight gave specific or additional input.

- ◆ Tri-City Herald, KNDU-TV
- ◆ Tri-City Herald
- ◆ I often use the Ecology Website to learn about Hanford activities and public involvement opportunities.
- ◆ The majority of the ads have been in the newspaper. The agencies need to do a better job notifying the local television and radio stations of upcoming activities.
- ◆ I saw ads for meetings in the Seattle Weekly and Seattle Times (but I was looking for them!) I didn't hear anything on the radio before the State of the Site meetings — that would have been helpful in turning out the public.
- ◆ Generally I'm not in an affected media market. I do read Tri-City Herald.
- ◆ I receive most info about meetings through NW Physicians for Social Responsibility (NWPSR).
- ◆ I usually find out through the HAB, not the media.
- ◆ Through my department or through DOE & Ecology contacts. EPA doesn't seem to show much interest in the tribe.

For the 2000 PI Survey, the answers from 27 responses were:

Yes-20

No-6

Don't Know- 1

6 - (If yes) The media notices were visually interesting and easy to understand.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)

1 2 3 4 5

Average = 3.6

Mode=4 (15 gave no rank)

2 3 10 1

Seven participants gave additional input as follows:

- ◆ I missed them consistently.
- ◆ Getting better
- ◆ I didn't see any media notices, to recall. The notices I got were directly from people involved, e.g. "Hanford Happenings" & Heart of America Northwest.
- ◆ I'm not a good person to assess, I get regular info as a HAB Rep. and member of NWPSR Hanford Task Force.
- ◆ Getting better... Institutional Control reverted to too many words, but others are getting crisper.
- ◆ These did improve in the second half of the year.
- ◆ Use of Seattle Weekly, Willamette Week, and visuals for those ads improved – i.e. State of the Site. How ever these efforts are somewhat inadequate if do not use ads in daily papers on Sunday for major issues – upcoming solid waste EIS, Annual Budget...

For the 2000 PI Survey, with 21 respondents, the average ranking was 3.4

7 - Did the notices motivate you to attend a meeting or to contact the Tri-Parties about an issue?

Yes-9

No-11

Don't Know- 1

No response-10

For the 2000 PI Survey, the answers from 22 responses were:

Yes-3

No-17

Don't Know- 1

Not Applicable -1

If you attended any public meeting(s), focus group(s) or other meeting(s) please rate the following:

8 - The time, location, and room setup were appropriate.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)	1	2	3	4	5
Average = 4			1	3	12
Mode=4 (6 gave no rank)					6
<i>Fourteen participants gave additional input.</i>					

- ◆ I can always find the location and it always works.
- ◆ Consulted local folks.
- ◆ State of the Site meeting in Seattle on campus, parking almost impossible.
- ◆ Several times the location was one I was not familiar with, and if I hadn't had a street map, I'd not have found them—and even so, it wasn't easy. And that was meetings in Seattle—many meetings are simply far beyond my capacity to attend—too far away,
- ◆ Tank forums were good because you gave public a chance to give direction and everyone listened and worked together.
- ◆ January 2002 Seattle meeting was great. (State of the Site)
- ◆ There has been a conscious effort by ORP to provide informal and open formats that encourage dialogue and exchanges of information with the public. I believe we have made positive progress.
- ◆ Seattle State of Site meeting, good set-up and facilitation. Parking tough. HAB meetings good set up locations, etc.
- ◆ During the past year, the Agencies have made an effort to be open to suggestions for location and setup of meeting rooms. I have been very satisfied.
- ◆ There are different audiences and approaches depending on where you are meeting and who you are, hoping will attend. We have been very successful in Oregon, please always contact Oregon Office if Energy in coordinating these events.
- ◆ I went to the State of the Site in Seattle in January. The room was OK, but the parking situation was not as convenient as I had expected, and I wouldn't have found it if Heart Of America volunteers hadn't put up signs that said 'this way'.
- ◆ Portland State Office Bldg. space too crowded & warm for State of the Site meeting. Hood River facility for CRP was very good.
- ◆ The Community Relations Plan meeting in Seattle, the River Corridor change package in Hood River.
- ◆ Yes, except State of the Site in Portland. Mountaineers worked in Seattle for CRP.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 22 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.7** *3.7*

9 - The written materials provided at the meeting(s) were informative and easy to understand.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)

1 2 3 4 5

Average = 3.6

Mode=4 (8 gave no rank)

1 8 9 5

Nine participants gave additional input as follows:

- ◆ No. Need to specifically address how proposed decision may affect your interests. Should make a special section since keep failing to meet this.
- ◆ Ecology's "tabloid" information has been good information sources for the public.
- ◆ Generally I receive copies of presentations and take my notes on those copies, this is handy.
- ◆ I'm not good at analyzing this. Everything that I've seen has been fine.
- ◆ Again, there is a wide range of materials available. Some or more easily understood than others. The agencies need to continue working together to develop more "reader-friendly" materials.
- ◆ Materials tend to be high-level general information. However the issues that the Tri-Parties really need public input on to decide amongst alternatives is often not evident. For example, the 100 Area change package didn't highlight what kind of input the Tri-Parties wanted.
- ◆ Easy to understand, mostly yes. Informative? There was far too much duplication, and some areas were glossed over. I've seen little or no mention, for example of what kind of flora and fauna are found in the area, and how they are thriving. And what about climate? Also, in descriptions of the geology, there were several references to sediments laid down in 'catastrophic floods' but no mention as to the cause of those floods, or how likely they are to be repeated—something it might be useful to know, eh? :-)
- ◆ Materials distributed on tables tend to be pretty technical.
- ◆ Since I was reading them from a technical perspective they were easy to understand, but also looked clear for general public consumption.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 21 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.6**

10 - The audio/visuals (overheads, slides, videos) were informative and easy to understand.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)	1	2	3	4	5
Average = 3.4			3	10	10
Mode= 3&4 tied (5 gave no rank)				3	
<i>Nine participants gave additional input as follows:</i>					

- ◆ Budget briefings by ORP are more effective since we've used more "public friendly" graphics and pictures to describing work, progress and funding needs.
- ◆ The John Morse and Jim Daily presentations on March 12 2002 were bad. The John Price, Kevin Clarke and Pete Knollmeyer presentations were excellent.
- ◆ Rarely
- ◆ Tanks meeting in Portland very good.
- ◆ Budget meetings slides were too detailed, have too much information. Presentations should show something, not tell.
- ◆ I'm not good at analyzing this. Everything that I've seen has been fine.
- ◆ The audio/visuals were informative and easy to understand.
- ◆ Usually, the videos are helpful. I often feel that, again, the DOE material is too promotional. I don't come to a public meeting to get pumped up about moving canisters from K-Basins to storage. I come to hear about both successes and problems so that I can have all the information I need to give my comment.
- ◆ Some diagrams were good—I learned more from some simple plans than in hours of talk—but photographs were often pale, and some details could not be seen—legends that were too small to read, etc. Some of this was adequately supplemented by displays on walls, etc.—other parts were not.
- ◆ This is an area that needs more work. Agency communications and Public Involvement experts need to work with presenters and review all materials prior to public meetings/processes to ensure that they are easily understood.
- ◆ Generally all public information type materials are easy to understand, sometimes technical presentation materials are less clear.
- ◆ In general, presenters did a good job at that (the Seattle State of the Site) meeting to convey a lot of technical information in a short period of time.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 21 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.7**

11 - Tri-Party speakers used language and presentation styles that made the information understandable.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)	1	2	3	4	5
Average = 3.4 Mode=4 (4 gave no rank)	1	4	8	11	3
<i>Fifteen participants gave additional input as follows:</i>					

- ◆ Wade Ballard at Annual Priorities meetings made claims that wastes were no longer disposed direct to ground as pictured – Yet recent photos showed him wrong. Marked difference in 2001 between Office of River Protection (ORP) and DOE Richland Operations (RL) with ORP being much more clear, identifying controversy of setbacks or risks. Public appreciated this. RL gets a one, ORP and regulators both get a four ranking.
- ◆ The language and presentation styles were quite understandable to the initiated. They are less accessible to the public. Todd's (Martin) lead off presentation for State of the Site was a good example of an accessible presentation.
- ◆ Pretty good, but there is always room for improvement in making technical issues understandable.
- ◆ Short and succinct presentations that allow more time for public discussions are an improvement.
- ◆ It was very much appreciated and effective to have Fitzsimmons, Klein, and Boston at the Seattle State of the Site meeting.
- ◆ Community Relations Plan Meetings were good, but the material is a little easier to understand. At the River corridor Change package meeting the presentations were pretty good, considering the more technical nature of the issue.
- ◆ The John Morse and Jim Daily presentations on March 12, 2002 were bad. The John Price, Kevin Clarke and Pete Knollmeyer presentations were excellent.
- ◆ Again, this is an area that needs improvement.
- ◆ State of the Site meeting good.
- ◆ I'm not good at analyzing this. Everything that I've seen has been fine.
- ◆ Still need to work on length of speaking and getting public *direct* answers to questions.
- ◆ Again because of my perspective I am probably not a great judge of this.
- ◆ Some did. Sometimes, however, in an attempt to be understandable, they went too far. One problem technical people often run into when communicating with the lay public is that they explain (even over explain) simple concepts, and leave really quite difficult ones unexplained.
- ◆ During the Community Relations Plan public meetings, I was very impressed by the Agencies' use of lay terms. The budget meetings are tough because they require some discussion of technical issues. Usually, I find that EPA representatives try to speak directly to the people about issues that effect them most. Ecology staff sent to public meetings are often either not equipped to answer public questions (they have lack of technical knowledge) or they are too technical and uninspiring. DOE speakers often use technical terms to (intentionally or unintentionally) term people off. They often seem uncomfortable and defensive (more RL than ORP).
- ◆ Variable. Some DOE speakers still too "in the weeds."

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 21 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.5**

12 - Tri-Party speakers were responsive and sensitive to different views and opinions.

Scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest)	1	2	3	4	5
Average = 3.5 Mode = 4 (4 gave no rank)	1	2	8	12	4
<i>Fifteen participants gave additional input as follows:</i>					

- ◆ I think the Community Relations Plan meetings and State of the Site meetings demonstrated the agencies' willingness to really listen to what the public and stakeholders have to say.
- ◆ Much improvement in this area compared with previous years.
- ◆ RL gets a one here as well. ORP a four, regulators a three. Saw clear impact of public views on: b) Ecology and EPA hearing public concern on groundwater at State of the Site. However, we know DOERL and contractors sought to eliminate key 100 Area groundwater action excepts for public pressure from meetings, regulators not responsive to high public concern on FFTF TPA enforcement of shutdown schedule.
- ◆ Well handled by folks.
- ◆ State of the Site meetings very good.
- ◆ As much as they are able.
- ◆ In my limited experience – since joining Nez Perce staff in October – WA Ecology and DOE folks have always been welcoming and helpful.
- ◆ Always room for improvement, State of the Site meetings allowed for a lot of interaction between speakers and the public.
- ◆ State of the Site was unsatisfactory, long windedness, not very direct or timely answers, too much “cheerleading.”
- ◆ Majority are. I think all start out meaning to be.
- ◆ Well, they were trying to be. Some people were clearly listening— noting and responding to specific points— but if more information was needed than was available at the time, I’ve found follow up inadequate.
- ◆ In general, presenters did a good job at that (Seattle) meeting to convey a lot of technical information in a short period of time.
- ◆ Generally, Tri-Party speakers show respect to all and try and respond to different views and opinions. Sometimes I get the impression Tri-Party representatives come into a meeting with negative expectations—this sours their ability to be responsive to different views.
- ◆ Variable.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, with 16 respondents, the **average** ranking was **3.6**

13- Other than this public involvement report, did you provide any ideas to the Tri-Parties on issues during this reporting period?

Yes- 21

No-6

Don't recall-1

No response-3

Seventeen participants gave additional input as follows:

- ◆ I've submitted written comments on the EPA 5 Year Record of Decision (ROD) review; EPA Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for B Reactor; EPA public comment on 300-FF? operable unit; brief comments on Ecology's sand and gravel permits for tank waste treatment facility; EPA ROD for Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility. I also attended Tri-Cities 2001 budget meeting, tank forum in Portland, and State of the Site meeting (TC's).
- ◆ HPIN Ecology Meetings – which we appreciate! 100/300 Area change package.
- ◆ I haven't been in my position long enough to comment with any intensity.
- ◆ Through Public Involvement HAB Committee meetings.
- ◆ As an agency representative I don't think I can comment on this.
- ◆ Written and verbal comments at meetings.
- ◆ I work for an agency. Providing ideas is my job.
- ◆ Ad hoc participation in evaluation of a flier.
- ◆ Daily...
- ◆ HAB input.
- ◆ I would hope you would know by now-
 - Each locale has its own meeting style needs.
 - Different kinds of meetings for different times/crowds.
 - More understandable materials.
- ◆ It's my job to do so in some circumstances.
- ◆ I am on the Public Involvement Committee of the HAB. I have some ideas to share Hanford info with the public-separate from the usual public meetings.
- ◆ I have carefully read every thing I've been sent, and have responded with comments and questions whenever it's been clear how to do so. Sometimes I've seen evidence that my comments have been noted—other times it's less clear.
- ◆ I submitted some comments on the 5 year review activity to Dennis Faulk - these came in after the deadline, however, due to some organizational issues on my end. But in general, Dennis at EPA and Joy Turner/Max Power/MaryAnne Wuennecke at Ecology are always receptive to comments and feedback. I believe they take them into consideration.
- ◆ As chair of the HAB Public Involvement Committee and a staff person at Heart of America NW, I am active in aiding the Tri-Parties with advice and ideas for public involvement activities.
- ◆ You should obtain coffee at the beginning of the first day (of HAB meetings.) Could ask some of the larger organizations that have members to fund this action.
- ◆ You should obtain coffee at the beginning of the first day (of HAB meetings.) Could ask some of the larger organizations that have members to fund this action.

For the **2000 PI Survey**, the answers from 27 responses were:

Yes-20

No-6

Don't Know- 1

14 - During the Reporting Period, were there Hanford issues you think the Tri-Parties handled especially well or issues that could have been handled better? Please Explain.

- ◆ Dedicate a section of each notice/background mailing called “How Proposed Decision(s) May Affect Your Values or Concerns.”
- ◆ 100Area workshop handled well, FFTF handled poorly (HQ actions didn’t help.)
- ◆ Good continued actions like the Columbia River Corridor Co...?? by the DOB Board.
- ◆ Make sure each agency is fulfilling it’s obligation to meet regularly with the different tribes.
- ◆ I’m not sure what is meant by issues...
- ◆ We can still improve in the clearness of our documents and the timing for public notification.
- ◆ We (the TPA Agency Public Involvement folks) are doing a better job of soliciting stakeholder input and suggestions on where and how public activities are implemented.
- ◆ TPA Milestone packages processes generally well handled. Budget meetings haven’t worked well, in part because the budget isn’t actually known when the meetings are held.
- ◆ Once again, the budget issue is a misery. It continues to be frustrating and alarming. Not going to the public is the only option. I’d like to see this change.
- ◆ Overall State of the Site meetings were a good opportunity and should be repeated regularly.
- ◆ Good- Tank forums
Bad- budget meetings (except in Portland for the 1st hour when we were all around the table – less adversarial).
State of the Site – great idea – poor performance.
- ◆ For the past two years the budget process has been poor. Hanford was a real groundbreaker in terms of sharing budget info, and gathering input. This process has unfortunately broken down. Lesson is: when you get it right, keep doing it!!
- ◆ To enhance public awareness about health and environmental risks at Hanford, the Agencies need to be more straight-forward about risks.
- ◆ Budget meetings always leave room for improvement. The Community Relations Plan meetings went really well, and the State of the Site meetings also went really well, especially for an inaugural event of that size and scope.
- ◆ *Good* meetings: December meeting in Portland, January meeting TC’s – I especially appreciated Tom Fitzsimmons’ response to [[...participant’s]] whine. Way to go!
Poor meeting: March (2001) budget meeting; don’t have budget meetings before you have reasonably firm information to report.
- ◆ Meetings were mostly okay, if too brightly lit. Documents often give the impression of being hastily slapped together—identical responses are often given to different comments, and some of the responses seem, frankly, dismissive. Proofreading would definitely help—spell-checkers will not catch a legitimate word used in the wrong context. Also, I would like to see a catalog of available documents made accessible, with a few words explaining what each document is, and what it covers. I realize that this may be a monumental undertaking, but such a thing must surely exist somewhere—directions to it might be enough.
- ◆ I’m very pleased to see this public involvement survey being done, I know groups like the Hanford Openness Workshop have argued strongly for more evaluation of public involvement activities.
- ◆ DOE must improve its responsiveness and accountability to the public. My husband still awaits a response to a letter to DOE legal (Bob Southworth?) he wrote on 2/27/2001.
- ◆ One final need in the near future is work with stakeholders to participate in the development of institutional controls.

Hanford issues you think the Tri-Parties handled especially well or issues that could have been handled better, cont'd...

- ◆ I'm quite dismayed to see so many documents and materials being removed from the Hanford website due to "security" issues. I don't believe that the AR/PIR internet database is currently working. This is really bad. Hanford was at the Cutting edge of the DOE complex in terms of sharing information accessibly with its stakeholders and now an incredibly useful resource is gone. When there are real security issues, of course precaution should prevail, but I hope the regulators argue to re-post much of this non-sensitive information as soon as possible.
- ◆ One thing I have continued to struggle with over and over is how you all keep track of the TPA milestones. I think some sort of tracking system that the public can get access to (either in the libraries or on the internet) is warranted. At this point unless you go to old printed versions of Appendix D in the TPA, you can't see what has been done and taken off the list. I think you guys would benefit greatly from having a better tool to track and communicate successful completion of milestones.
- ◆ The 2003 budget discussions were very hard to plan for. This was due to many circumstances, but I think the agencies need to realize that there are *always* going to be public meetings on the budget and they should plan ahead as much as possible. The Community Relations Plan public involvement process went very well. I was also impressed by the State of the Site meetings, although they were held at an inopportune time. It seems that there wasn't a lot of information available on possible DOE changes to the future of Clean-Up. It might have been wiser to plan that meeting for later in the year instead of hurrying it.
- ◆ December Tank Forum (Portland) and State of Site meetings done well. CRP meetings in Hood River and Seattle reasonably well done. Generally co-hosting with Non-Profit groups works well. What's missing from the list is any significant outreach effort by DOE with regard to FFTF review, River Corridor contract, impending waste management decisions.
- ◆ The Tri-Parties seem to finally to acknowledge that risk should be evaluated as part of the determination of the extent and intensity of cleanup actually needed. The language of the budget needs, however still acts as though everything is top priority and must be done Cadillac quality. There is a fear of letting the public know that a necessary and sufficient cleanup might not be as difficult or expensive as it was made out to be.
- ◆ The general issues were covered very well with few exceptions. However, issues that are important such as following Navigable River Laws, the Columbia River Treaty, as it applies were ignored. Statements like pristine lands, natural flowing, with their implications should be dropped. These are not so.

15 - Do you have any suggestions for improving Tri-Party Agreement public information and involvement?

- ◆ I'd sure like to get more information, I'm not sure I ever got any.
- ◆ Keep progressing towards more interactive public outreach – Tank Forum, State of the Site
- ◆ I stopped in Hood River on my way home from my Oregon Board meeting and attended a review - led by Joy Turner – of the Site Wide Public Involvement Document. It was outstanding. 1.) Good public participation, 2.) Joy was very professional and accessible by participants. 3.) Very good to see.
- ◆ Cut the meetings to 1.5 days. (HAB)
- ◆ Just keep asking me.
- ◆ Strategize for a full year's worth of activity. Strategically thinking here about the State of the Site meetings is important. Currently the public has a tough time figuring out where their concerns are best expressed (FFTF in the budget hearings for example.) Ideally, you figure out what people care about and then design your processes to best elicit ongoing input. This makes it most effective and efficient for you and the public.
- ◆ Work to keep reading materials to 8th grade level. It *can* be done and not only will more people understand, more people will understand *more*.
- ◆ Utilize your built-in public involvement mechanism – The HAB – more effectively. Expect more of the board, in terms of assisting the agencies with public involvement. Drag them out to the public, 'cause that Todd Martin guy is good (And I'm not him.)
- ◆ I would be happy to have a discussion on this topic with those interested at the Agencies.
- ◆ More public friendly documents - no jargon, identify key issues and areas for concern or discussion.
 - Be more timely in notification.
 - Encourage and engage stakeholders in discussions for improving information sharing with their constituencies.
- ◆ The agencies need to continue to improve our internal processes, including meeting planning, development of materials, and information sharing. The agencies need to continue working with the stakeholders to make sure the public participation activities we develop meet the needs of the public. We also need to expand our horizon and make sure we continue seeking participation and representation from a wide cross-section of the public and stakeholders — not just relying on the same standby groups we always hear from and fall back on. We need to promote good relationships between the stakeholder groups to avoid bickering and controversy about how the public processes will be conducted.
- ◆ It appears to me that data used has to be honest and factual. At the present time seemingly fake and imagined information will be in big trouble. Example – The areas have been burned off several times. Now it appears to me only noxious weeds. Very little wildlife, as there is little food. River is a controlled flow, the banks have many Inputs and Discharge Structures.
- ◆ The land on the North and East Side of the Columbia River are committed to farms, all of this land was purchased and billed to the farmers account in the United States Treasury Account. The farmers have paid off approximately half but we only have half of the project built. Our government and its agencies have to be our source of truth.
- ◆ *Your Websites do not work*- at least I have not been able to use.
- ◆ Record the attendance – at least an estimate of the number of public (excluding TPA agency and contractor staff) include attendance figures in future reports like this. Record the estimated cost of each meeting (including notices, meeting room costs, travel costs for agencies and contractors, and overtime payment for support staff.)
- ◆ Many ideas emerge each day... I do share them with others.
- ◆ In general, (please use) the Hanford Openness Workshop Recommendations.
- ◆ For more specifics, see the Decision Mapping System (<http://nalu.geog.washington.edu/dms>)

Suggestions for improving Tri-Party Agreement public information and involvement, cont'd...

- ◆ I want to say that it's been great working with the Agencies to organize meetings — processes are getting better and better.
- ◆ Get DOE to link National Environmental Policy Act public involvement to other activities covered in CRP (Community Relations Plan). (Oops, I guess the acronym needs to be updated, too.) Co-host events with non-profits, Oregon, Tribes, etc. Continue improving web-based involvement and access to information. Focus on setting “big picture” context through State of the Site meetings and other activities. It will be really important in the coming year to help people relate to the overall picture and not get lost in myriad specific changes, disputes, etc.
- ◆ I think I have already written too much! I suggest that the agencies continue to work on their own presentations and written materials -- make sure they are friendly to lay folks. If this requires having someone from the “outside” design and write stuff, so be it.
- ◆ First acknowledge that Tri-Citians have a much greater stake in successful cleanup than Oregonians or Seattleites. Stop [...catering to] Oregon. Place greater emphasis on truthful reassurance and less on hysterical propaganda. The tritium plume was no big deal after all... Golly Gee!
- ◆ Continue to work with the agencies to communicate clear, simple messages. Promote opportunities for more dialogue.
- ◆ Occasionally give the history of how the Tri-Party Agreement came to be. Also the advantages *and disadvantages* of the Agreement.
- ◆ Work with USDOE and security agencies to maintain as much access to potentially useful information as possible.

Analysis and Commitments

Based on information gathered through this survey we are pleased to see that, in general, respondents were comfortable with the way public involvement opportunities are handled. Ranked scores were higher than in the last survey taken. We recognize that there were still some issues we must work to improve. To that end, we will continue to strive to get information to stakeholders in a timely fashion. We are also working hard to ensure that our publications meet high standards for both content and style.

The Tri-Party Agencies Will:

- ◆ **Continue annual State of the Site meetings.**
- ◆ **Expand descriptions of how different cleanup activities and end states may affect the public in publications we distribute.**
- ◆ **Dress up layout and graphics and use color when cost is not prohibitive.**
- ◆ **Work on the TPA website to be more user friendly and informative, and to provide a simple calendar for the public to track milestone activities, start, and completion dates.**